

Remarks

In this response, claim 36 is cancelled, without prejudice, claims 40 – 45 are added, and claims 27, 31, 37 – 39 have been amended.

Claims 3 – 6, 10 -11, 23, 26 – 28, 31 – 33, 35, and 37 – 45 are pending.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Final Office Action claims 27, 31, 3, 6, 10 – 11, 23, 26, 28, 32 – 33, and 35 – 38 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,897,622) (hereinafter “Blinn”) in view of Wolff (U.S. Patent No. 6,247,047) (hereinafter “Wolff”), and further in view of Bezos et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141) (hereinafter “Bezos”).

Claim 36 has been cancelled rendering its rejection moot.

Claim 27, as amended, recites, in part, an information server to interpret a second portion of a pseudo resource identifier as a marketing code identifying a type of media used to disseminate the URL. Portions of this element were originally presented in claim 36. As described in the specification URLs may be disseminated by any of a variety of types of media. Thus a portion of the URL may be modified to inform the information server of the type of media that was used to disseminate that particular URL. This information may allow the information server to maintain statistics (which is also an element of claim 27) on the effectiveness of the various types of media at disseminating the URLs.

Bezos, on the other hand, teaches a URL having a commission ID. The commission ID uniquely identifies an associate that refers a customer to the merchant’s website. The associate may communicate the URL, and related product information, to a potential customer through a store of catalog documents. Bezos column 6, lines 67 et seq. Bezos teaches that the catalog documents may be disseminated through a hypertextual media type (e.g., Internet) or a non-hypertextual media type (e.g., a paper-based product catalog). Bezos column 8, lines 32 – 48. However, the same URL will

be used regardless of the media type employed for dissemination. This is because the only information relevant to Bezos' teachings is the identification of the associate for a commission reward. The type of dissemination is irrelevant to Bezo's system, which is simply concerned with identifying the associate responsible for the catalog documents.

Furthermore, Bezos expressly teaches away from providing information indicative of the dissemination technique. The generic nature of dissemination is relied upon by Bezos so that the associate "...can use or switch between multiple catalog dissemination techniques (Web, e-mail, PUSH, etc.) without affecting the ability of the merchant Web site to identify and credit the associate."

In the rejection of claim 36, it was stated that "it is at least obvious to the skilled artisan that Bezos's system knows an associate's source as Internet based, or paper catalog based (typically a form of buyer's guide), so as to pay commissions accordingly..." The Applicants traverse this statement and find no support for Bezos' system simply "knowing" how the URL is disseminated, much less there being a portion of the URL interpreted as a marketing code OR that statistics are kept on marketing codes. In fact, as discussed above, Bezos specifically teaches away from using a dissemination-specific URL to identify how the URL was disseminated so that the associate may use any media type for dissemination without disrupting identification of the source.

In sum, while claim 27 specifically recites that the portion of the URL identifies how the URL was disseminated (i.e., the type of media used), Bezos, at best, only identifies who is the source of dissemination (the associate).

Thus, Bezos fails to teach or make obvious a marketing code that identifies the type of media used to disseminate the URL.

For at least these reasons this combination of asserted references fails to make claim 27, as a whole, obvious.

Claims 31, 3, 6, 10 – 11, 23, 26, 28, 32 – 33, and 35-38 depend from, or include limitations similar to, claim 27. Therefore, these claims are patentable over these references for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn, Bezos, Wolff, and Bijnagte (U.S. Patent No. 5,235,680) (hereinafter “Bijnagte”).

Claim 14 has been cancelled rendering its rejection moot.

Claim 4 ultimately depends on claim 27. Bijnagte fails to correct for the above noted deficiencies with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, this claim is also patentable over this asserted combination.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Blinn, Bezos, Wolff, and Kirkevold et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,263,322) (hereinafter “Kirkevold”).

Claim 5 ultimately depends on claim 27. Kirkevold fails to correct for the above noted deficiencies with respect to claim 27. Accordingly, this claim is also patentable over this asserted combination.

New Claims

The Applicants have taken this opportunity to present claims 40 – 45. These claims, similar to claim 27 discussed above, also include a recitation that a second portion of the pseudo resource identifier is interpreted as a marketing code identifying a type of media used to disseminate the URL. In addition to this recitation, these claims include other recitations that further distinguish the claims from cited references.

For example, claim 44 recites that at least a portion of the provided information page is based at least in part on the type of media identified. This recitation is similar to a recitation provided in claim 39, which was indicated as being allowable. As previously discussed, there is no teaching in cited references that discusses customizing the information page based on the identity of the type of media.

For another example, claim 45 recites that statistics are maintained for a plurality of marketing codes, including the marketing code, respectively corresponding to a plurality of types of media, including the type of media. While none of the cited references teach a first marketing code corresponding to a first type of media, they most certainly do not teach a plurality of marketing codes respectively corresponding to a plurality of types of media.

Conclusion

For these reasons the Applicants believe the present claims are patentable over the cited references and, therefore, respectfully request that a Notice of Allowance be issued. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (503) 796-2972. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: 03/28/2008

/Nathan R. Maki/
Nathan R. Maki
Reg. No. 51110

Pacwest Center, Suite 1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981